

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on September 6, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. It is respectfully submitted that entry of the above amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in that the amendments (1) place the claims in condition for allowance or, if necessary, in better condition for consideration on appeal; and (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further consideration or search. For the reasons given above, entry of the above claim amendments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

In the present application, independent claims 42 and 52 have been amended to include features currently recited in previously presented independent claim 33 which specify a node including a first module and a second module, wherein the first module and the second module are colocated within the node. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter in the aforementioned claim amendments has previously been presented and thus does not raise new issues or require further consideration and/or search.

In the Office Action, claims 33 and 37-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al. (US 6,816,481, hereinafter “Adams”) in view of Bhandari et al. (US 6,891,940, hereinafter “Bhandari”). Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Bhandari and further in view of Devillier (US 5,850,435).

Applicant’s Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between the undersigned and the Examiner was held on January 4, 2007 to discuss the rejection of independent claim 33 in view of the Adams

and Bhandari references. In the interview, the undersigned pointed out that Bhandari, relied upon for allegedly disclosing first and second modules which are colocated within a node, in fact only shows a plurality of servers in communication with a single database with no indication of two modules being collocated within a single node. Thus, contrary to the allegations in the Office Action, Bhandari does not show that databases (e.g., modules) can be collocated together. The Examiner agreed with the aforementioned interpretation of Bhandari and agreed to consider arguments submitted in an After Final amendment. The Examiner further agreed to enter amendments to independent claims 42 and 53 to include the feature discussed above for further consideration after final.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 33 and 37-52

Claims 33 and 37-52 are rejected as being anticipated by Adams in view of Bhandari. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 33 specifies a system for notifying an Internet-accessible device of a communication placed from a first telecommunications device to a second telecommunications device by a calling party. The system includes a switch for detecting the communication; and a node in communication with the switch, wherein the node is configured for communicating information associated with the first telecommunications device to the Internet-accessible device over the Internet, wherein the second telecommunications device is associated with a called party and is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with the Internet-accessible device. The node includes a first module for determining information about the calling party utilizing the first telecommunication device, wherein the information

comprises a name and a directory number of the calling party; and a second module for determining information about the Internet-accessible device, wherein the node accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module and wherein the first module and the second module are colocated within the node.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Adams and Bhandari fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 33. As discussed in Applicants' previous response (and conceded in the Office Action), Adams fails to teach that the second telecommunications device is associated with a called party and is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with the Internet-accessible device, that the node accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module, and that the first module and the second module are colocated within the node. Instead, Adams discusses a subscriber phone 18 and an ICW subscriber PC 25 which is on the same communications line to the SSP 20 (see Figure 1). Thus, Adams fails to disclose a separate communications line. Furthermore, the Office Action alleges Adams discloses a node (the ISCP 40), a first module (the LIDB 50), and a second module (the registration server 80) – see Figure 1. However, Adams fails to disclose that the ISCP 40 accesses the LIDB 50 (first module) prior to accessing the registration server 80 (second module). Instead, Adams specifically points out that the registration server 80 is the first database accessed by the ISCP 40. Adams also fails to disclose that the LIDB 50 and the registration server 80 are colocated within the ISCP 40 (in Adams, the LIDB 50 and the registration server 80 are external to and thus are not colocated within the ISCP 40).

Bhandari, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Adams, discusses providing remote access to telecommunications services. In the Office

Action, it is alleged that Bhandari teaches that servers and databases can be configured, linked and collocated together in Figure 8 and in col. 12, lines 16-50. However, Figure 8 in Bhandari merely shows a plurality of servers in communication with a single database with no indication of any two modules being collocated within a single node. Furthermore, col. 12, lines 16-50 in Bhandari merely discusses that the servers may be incorporated into each other. Thus, contrary to the allegations in the Office Action, Bhandari does not show that databases (e.g., modules) can be collocated together within a node. It is further respectfully submitted that Bhandari, like Adams, also fails to disclose a node which accesses a first module prior to accessing a second module. As shown in Figure 8 of Bhandari, only a single database is disclosed for access by the plurality of servers.

Based on the foregoing, independent claim 33 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 37-41 depend from claim 33 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claims 42 and 52 recite similar features as those found in amended independent claim 33 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 43-51 depend from claim 42 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of claims 37-52 should also be withdrawn.

Claims 34-36

Claims 34-36 are rejected as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Bhandari and Devillier. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 34-36 depend from amended independent claim 33 and thus specify at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Adams and Bhandari fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 33. Devillier,

relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Adams and Bhandari, merely discloses the use of a wireless telephone set for receiving caller ID information. Thus, Devillier, like Adams and Bhandari fails to disclose at least the following features: a second telecommunications device associated with a called party and which is on a communications line separate from a communications line associated with an Internet-accessible device (Devillier is concerned with an intelligent telephone network and thus does not discuss Internet communications or Internet-accessible devices), a node which accesses the first module prior to accessing the second module, and the first module and the second module being colocated within the node. See Figures 4 and 5. Accordingly, claims 34-36 are allowable over the combination of Adams, Bhandari, and Devillier and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

The present Amendment is being filed with a request and fee for a one-month extension of time. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: January 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748